

Serial No. 10/798,629

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 3 has been amended.

Attachment: Replacement sheets for Fig. 3.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, is being requested. Claims 1-27 are in this application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 11, 14-15, 17-19, 21-22 and 24-25 have been amended.

Correction to Fig. 3

Fig. 3 has been amended to be consistent with the description thereof. In particular, Fig. 3 is described in the specification using reference numerals 3xx. By contrast, original Fig. 3 included reference numerals 2xx. The reference numerals in Fig. 3 has been amended to be 3xx.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 5, 11, 17, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regard as the invention. Specifically, the office action alleges that there exist insufficient basis for D, Ex and Be interfaces in claims 5, 11, 17, 21 or 24, and that it is not clear what D, Ex and Be interfaces are. Claims 5, 11, 17, 21 and 24 have been amended to clearly describe the aforementioned interfaces. Specifically, the D interface in claim 5 has been replaced with a network interface between a public service answering point emergency call register and a public service answering point call center; the Ex interface in claim 11 has been replaced with a network interface between an emergency call register and a mobile switching center; Be interface in claims 17 and 21 have been replaced with a network interface between a emergency service message entity and the public service answering point emergency call register; and the D interface in claim 5 has been replaced with a network interface between the emergency service message entity and the public service answering point call center. Support for the amendments can be found in Figs. 1 and 3. Accordingly, it is felt that claims 5, 11, 17, 21 and 24, as amended, are now patentable under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) - Gafrick

Claims 1, 8, 14, 18 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gafrick et al. (EP 1124394A1). Specifically, the office action alleges that Gafrick discloses a method for re-establishing a call in a communication system comprising: receiving at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit; and

transmitting a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier.

Applicant respectfully traverses for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the limitations of “receiving from a public service answering point call center at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit; and transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier in response to receiving the at least one tag identifier.” (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in steps 160 and 170 of Fig. 2 and in page 11, lines 19-29 of the specification. By contrast, Gafrick discloses receiving from a network element a callback request having a Emergency Services Callback Number (ESCN), and transmitting to a mobile unit an alert having a callback number. See Gafrick, paragraphs [0033] through [0035]. Gafrick does not disclose or suggest receiving from a public service answering point call center a tag identifier and transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless callback number in response to receiving the tag identifier. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Gafrick.

Claim 8, as amended, recites the limitation of “transmitting to the emergency call register and a public service answering point call center at least one tag identifier from a mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in steps 120-150 of Fig. 2 and in page 9, line 23 to page 11, line 18 of the specification. By contrast, Gafrick discloses transmitting to a mobile unit an alert having a callback number from a mobile switching center (MSC). See Gafrick, paragraph [0035]. Gafrick does not disclose or suggest transmitting to an emergency call register and a public service answering point call center a tag identifier from a mobile switching center. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 8 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Gafrick.

Claim 14, as amended, recites the limitations of “transmitting at least one tag identifier to the emergency service message entity” and “entering the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Gafrick discloses transmitting to a mobile unit an alert having a callback number. See Gafrick, paragraph [0035]. Gafrick does not disclose or suggest transmitting a tag identifier to an emergency service message entity or entering the tag identifier into the emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 14 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Gafrick.

Claim 18, as amended, recites the limitations of “receiving at least one tag identifier at the emergency service message entity” and “entering the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Gafrick discloses receiving at a mobile switching center (MSC) a callback request having a Emergency Services Callback Number (ESCN). See Gafrick, paragraph [0033]. Gafrick does not disclose or suggest receiving a tag identifier at an emergency service message entity or entering the tag identifier at the emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 18 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Gafrick.

Claim 22, as amended, recites the limitation of “transmitting at least one tag identifier from the mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit to an emergency service message entity in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Gafrick discloses transmitting to a mobile unit an alert having a callback number from a mobile switching center (MSC). See Gafrick, paragraph [0035]. Gafrick does not disclose or suggest transmitting a tag identifier from a mobile switching center to an emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 22 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) - Maupin

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Maupin et al (5,689,548). With regards to claim 1, the office action alleges that Maupin discloses an emergency call back using MSC numbers comprising: receiving at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit; and transmitting a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 1, as amended, recites the limitation of “transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier in response to receiving the at least one tag identifier.” (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in steps 160 and 170 of Fig. 2 and in page 11, lines 19-29 of the specification. By contrast, Maupin discloses transmitting to a public service answering point (PSAP) a first Initial Address Message (IAM), wherein the first IAM comprises of a calling party number (CgPN) and a Mobile Station Integrated Service Directory Number (MSISDN). Maupin further discloses, in response to receiving the first IAM, transmitting to a mobile

switching center (MSC) a second IAM from the PSAP, wherein the second IAM comprise of a called party number (CdPN) and the MSISDN. See Maupin, Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 32-59. Maupin does not disclose, in response to receiving the tag identifier, transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless call back number. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Claims 2-7 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, it is felt that claims 2-7 are patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

With regards to claim 8, the office action alleges that Maupin discloses an emergency call back using MSC numbers comprising: transmitting at least one tag identifier from a mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 8, as amended, recites the limitation of “transmitting to the emergency call register and a public service answering point call center at least one tag identifier from a mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in steps 120-150 of Fig. 2 and in page 9, line 23 to page 11, line 18 of the specification. By contrast, Maupin discloses transmitting to a public service answering point (PSAP) a first Initial Address Message (IAM), wherein the first IAM comprises of a calling party number (CgPN) and a Mobile Station Integrated Service Directory Number (MSISDN). Maupin further discloses transmitting to a mobile switching center (MSC) a second IAM from the PSAP, wherein the second IAM comprise of a called party number (CdPN) and the MSISDN. See Maupin, Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 32-59. Maupin does not disclose or suggest transmitting to an emergency call register a tag identifier from a mobile switching center. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 8 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Claims 9-13 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 8. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 8, it is felt that claims 9-13 are patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

With regards to claim 14, the office action alleges that Maupin discloses an emergency call back using MSC numbers comprising: transmitting at least one tag identifier from the emergency call register; and entering the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity”. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 14, as amended, recites the limitations of “transmitting at least one tag identifier to the emergency service message entity” and “entering

the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity". (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Maupin discloses transmitting to a public service answering point (PSAP) a first Initial Address Message (IAM), wherein the first IAM comprises of a calling party number (CgPN) and a Mobile Station Integrated Service Directory Number (MSISDN). Maupin further discloses transmitting to a mobile switching center (MSC) a second IAM from the PSAP, wherein the second IAM comprise of a called party number (CdPN) and the MSISDN. See Maupin, Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 32-59. Maupin does not disclose or suggest transmitting a tag identifier to an emergency service message entity or entering the tag identifier into the emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 14 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Claims 15-17 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 14. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 14, it is felt that claims 15-17 are patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

With regards to claim 18, the office action alleges that Maupin discloses an emergency call back using MSC numbers comprising: receiving at least one tag identifier from an emergency call register; and entering the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 18, as amended, recites the limitations of "receiving at least one tag identifier at the emergency service message entity" and "entering the at least one tag identifier into the emergency service message entity". (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Maupin discloses receiving at a public service answering point (PSAP) a first Initial Address Message (IAM), wherein the first IAM comprises of a calling party number (CgPN) and a Mobile Station Integrated Service Directory Number (MSISDN). Maupin further discloses receiving at a mobile switching center (MSC) a second IAM from the PSAP, wherein the second IAM comprise of a called party number (CdPN) and the MSISDN. See Maupin, Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 32-59. Maupin does not disclose or suggest receiving a tag identifier at an emergency service message entity or entering the tag identifier at the emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 18 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Claims 19-21 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 18. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 18, it is felt that claims 19-21 are patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

With regards to claim 22, the office action alleges that Maupin discloses an emergency call back using MSC numbers comprising: transmitting at least one tag identifier from the mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit to an emergency service entity in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 22, as amended, recites the limitation of “transmitting at least one tag identifier from the mobile switching center associated with the at least one wireless unit to an emergency service message entity in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit”. (underline added for emphasis) Support for the amendment can be found in step 430 of Fig. 4 and in page 15, lines 3-9. By contrast, Maupin discloses transmitting to a public service answering point (PSAP) a first Initial Address Message (IAM), wherein the first IAM comprises of a calling party number (CgPN) and a Mobile Station Integrated Service Directory Number (MSISDN). Maupin further discloses transmitting to a mobile switching center (MSC) a second IAM from the PSAP, wherein the second IAM comprise of a called party number (CdPN) and the MSISDN. See Maupin, Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 32-59. Maupin does not disclose or suggest transmitting a tag identifier from a mobile switching center to an emergency service message entity. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 2 is patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

Claims 23-27 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 22. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 22, it is felt that claims 23-27 are patentable under 35 USC 102(b) over Maupin.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' attorney, Jimmy Goo, at (973) 386-6377.

Respectfully,

Douglas Rollender

By 

Jimmy Goo  
Reg. No. 27336  
(908) 582-7886

Serial No. 10/798,629

Date: 03/01/06

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)

Lucent Technologies Inc.

101 Crawfords Corner Road

Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

Attachment: Replacement sheet for Fig. 3